INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

| Defense' Witnesses | Page |
|---|-------|
| MINAMI, Jiro (resumed) | 20002 |
| Cross by Mr. Comyns Carr (cont'd) | 20002 |
| MORNING RECESS | 20024 |
| Cross by Mr. Comyns Carr (cont'd) | 20025 |
| Questions by The President, Sir William Webb | 20037 |
| NOON RECESS | 20041 |
| Questions by The President, Sir William Webb (cont'd) | 20042 |
| Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO | 20050 |
| AFTERNOON RECESS | 20064 |
| Questions by The President, Sir William Webb (cont'd) | 20065 |
| Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO | 20067 |

16 APRIL 1947

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Doc. Def. Pros.
No. No. No.

.835-A 2437

Description

For In Ident. Evidence

Letter from General MINAMI, Jire, Governor-General of Korea, to His Excellency the Foreign Minister UGAKI, Issei, dated 23 September 1938

Wednesday, 16 April 1947 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST
Court House of the Tribunal
War Ministry Building
Tokyo, Japan The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930. Appearances: For the Tribunal, same as before. For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before. (English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

M

0

e

&

20,002

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session. THE FRESIDENT: All the accused are present except TOGO, who the Sugamo prison surgeon says is unable to attend the trial today through illness. The certificate will be recorded and filed. The accused TOGO is represented by counsel. 7 Mr. Comyns Carr. 8 M I N A M I, one of the accused, resumed 10 the stand and testified through Japanese inter-11 preters as follows: 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION 13 14

BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

- General MINAMI, it has been suggested to me that you didn't hear the last document, which I put to you, being read over the IBM. Is that so?
 - I could not hear very well.
- Well, perhaps you would like to look at it then; would you?

MR. COMYNE CARR: May he have the original of 195, please.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was handed to the witness.)

(Continuing) Just look at it for yourself

23

24

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

ell us whether there is anything you want to about it.

A I have glanced through to comment. I think this is a document in which an outline of publicity policy has been laid ont in case of an emergency or some eventuality and it appears to me that this was an internal arrangement between the Chief of Staff and the Vice-Limister; and for that reason, I do not recall this matter very well.

THE PRESIDENT: He recall: it, but not yery well, I take it.

Q But you told me yesterday that the Chief
Staff sent it with your approval.

A If so, I was mistaken.

14 A II so, I not that your Chief of Staff
15 Q Do you mean that your Chief of Staff
18 ould send a document of this kind to the Vice-War
18 inister contrary to your instructions?

A That is so. The sending or exchanging of

16 uch plans or ideas between the Chief of Staff and

20 the Vice-Minister is carried on internally between

21 themselves for the purpose of trying to seek a meet
22 ing of minds on certain subjects. Thus, if any

23 document is sent in the name of the Commander-in-Chief,

24 then such document goes only to the Minister and not

25 to the Vice-Minister.

and tell us whether there is anything you want to say about it.

A I have glanced through to comment. I think this is a document in with an outline of publicity policy has been laid on in case of in emergency or some eventuality and it appears to me that this was an internal arrangement between the Chief of Staff and the Vice-Linister; and for that reason, I do not recall this matter very well.

THE PRESIDENT: He recalls it, but not yery well, I take it.

Q But you told me yesterday that the Chief 19f Staff sent it with your approval.

A If so, I was mistaken.

Q Do you mean that your Chief of Staff

Would send a document of this kind to the Vice-War

Minister contrary to your instructions?

A That is so. The sending or exchanging of

16 uch plans or ideas between the Chief of Staff and

20 the Vice-Minister is carried on internally between

21 themselves for the purpose of trying to seek a meet
22 ing of minds on certain subjects. Thus, if any

23 document is sent in the name of the Commander-in-Chief,

24 then such document goes only to the Minister and not

25 to the Vice-Minister.

and tell us whether there is anything you want to say about it.

A I have glanced through the document. I think this is a document in which an outline of publicity policy has been laid out in case of an emergency or some eventuality and it appears to me that this was an internal arrangement between the Chief of Staff and the Vice-Minister; and for that reason, I do not recall this matter.

THE PRESIDENT: He recalls it, but not very well I take it.

Q But you told me yesterday that the Chief of Staff sent it with your approval.

A If so, I was mistaken,

Q Do you mean that your Chief of Staff
would send a document of this kind to the Vice-War
Minister contrary to your instructions?

A That is so. The sending or exchanging of such plans or ideas between the Chief of Staff and the Vice-Minister is carried on internally between themselves for the purpose of trying to seek a meeting of minds on certain subjects. Thus, if any document is sent in the name of the Commander-in-Chief, then such document goes only to the Minister and not to the Vice-Minister.

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q To you suggest that General NISHIO would have put forward a document like this without consulting it, without obtaining your approval of the substance of it?

A The practice of such documents being sent without the knowledge or approval of the Commanding General frequently happens.

THE PRESIDENT: But he said he recalled it.

- Q How do you recall it if it was sent without your knowledge or approval?
 - A I do not understand the question.
- Q You said a little while ago that you recalled the document although not very well; that is, remember it although not very well.

Section. Apparently there is confusion resulting from a misinterpretation or misunderstanding of the word "recall." That is, one has been taken from the standpoint of recollection, the other from the standpoint of calling the document back. We should like of the prosecutor to put a new question so that this confusion might be cleared up.

Q Did you not say a little while ago that you remember this document although not very well?

A Inasmuch as I was unable to understand

Q Do you suggest that General NISHIO would have put forward a document like this without consulting it, without obtaining your approval of the substance of it?

A The practice of such documents being sent without the knowledge or approval of the Commanding General frequently happens.

THE PRESIDENT: But he said he recalled it.

- Q How do you recall it if it was sent without your knowledge or approval?
 - A I do not understand the question.
- Q You said a little while ago that you recalled the document although not very well; that is, remembered it although not very well.

Section. Apparently there is confusion resulting from a misinterpretation or misunderstanding of the word "recall." That is, one has been taken from the standpoint of recollection, the other from the standpoint of calling the document back. We should like of the prosecutor to put a new question so that this confusion might be cleared up.

- Q Did you not say a little while ago that you read this document although not very well?
 - A Inasmuch as I was unable to understand

3 4

5

7 8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

23 24

25

that I be shown this document.

THE PRESIDENT: The word "recall" was first

what the document was about yesterday, I asked

used by the interpreter this morning as something said by MINAMI.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Would the interpreter

kindly tell us whether when that word was used in the first place by MINAMI the Japanese word meant remember or something different?

THE INTERPRETER: It meant in connection with recollection.

Q How do you recollect the document if it was issued without your authority or knowledge?

A When the document was read yesterday, I remembered a part of it, but not being quite familiar with it, I asked that I be shown this document. Having seen the document I said, as I have said before, that such documents as these were frequently exchanged between the Chief of Staff and the Vice-Minister in connection with matters which should be taken — action which should be taken in case of emergencies or eventualities.

Q That doesn't enswer the question. How do you remember it if it wasn't shown to you at the time when it was issued?

A I felt that such things really happened without having been told about the document yesterday. Well, I felt that such a thing may have happened without having been told of the document yesterday.

THE PRESIDENT: That answer cannot be recepted. It is a direct contradiction of what he said according to the interpreter this morning.

THE TITNESS: In short, I saw this document with my own eyes for the first time this morning and felt that this was a matter that was considered in case of eventualities. At least it isn't a document that I signed myself.

THE PRESIDENT: I think you ought to leave
it at that, Mr. Carr. We can form our own conclusions.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If your Honor pleases.

BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Q Now, General MINAMI, on page 16 of your affidavit, paragraph 10, the last sentence, you are speaking of what you did after you went to Korea, and you say, "As Governor General, I have nothing to say except that I devoted myself entirely to the elevation of the status and conditions of the Korean

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

people." Do you mean that you took no part in any matters that were going on outside Korea?

- A Exactly.
- Q In your interrogation you said this:

"Q What members of the cabinet other than the War Minister did you deal with?" That is when you were in Korea. Was that correct?

THE INTERPRETER: Mr. Comyns Carr, did you read the answer to that question? If you did, we did not hear it.

- Q (Continuing) The answer was the words beginning with "outside Korean affairs." "Outside Korean affairs I had no dealings whatsoever with members of the cabinet."
 - A That is so.
 - Q That answer is correct, is it?
 - A Correct.
- Q And in the course of your interrogation you also said 'his: "I might explain that in the last fifteen years the thing I have been most against was our war with China as I felt that the peace of Asia could not be maintained unless Japan and China remained at peace." Was that also correct?
 - A Yes, correct.
 - Q Now, who was your successor as commander in

chief of the Kwentung Army?

- A UEDA, Kenkichi; General.
- Q UEDA, yes. At the end of July, 1937, did you and UEDA send a written petition to the then Premier KONOYE for the movement of establishing a new administration in North China?
 - A 1937?
 - Q Yes.
 - A I did not sent.
- Q Then if Permier KONOYF said that he had received it what do you say to that?

A As far as I am concerned I do not recall the matter at all. If shown a document I might, but at the present time I have no recollection of it because I was Governor General of Korea at the time. That is 1937. And in the cabinet there was no other minister except the Minister of Overseas Affairs who had any dealings with me.

THE PRESIDENT: In the absence of some good reason you should show him the document, if you have it.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I haven't it, your Honor.

Q But I will show you, General MINAMI, another document which I have got and that is prosecution document 1835A. May the original be shown to the

2

5

_

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

2

23

| 1 | witness? |
|----|--|
| 1 | (Whereupon, a paper was handed to |
| 2 | the witness.) |
| 3 | THE PRESIDENT: What is the exhibit number? |
| 4 | Q (Continuing) Is that your letter? |
| 5 | MR. COMYNS CARR: It isn't at present an |
| 6 | exhibit, your Honor. I am seeking to make it one. |
| 7 | Q (Continuing) General MINAMI, you can tell |
| 8 | me whether it is your letter without waiting to read |
| 9 | it all. |
| 10 | THE PRESIDENT: Look at the signature or |
| 11 | seal. Is it yours? |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: I don't recall it very well. |
| 13 | THE PRESIDENT: What do you mean? Do you |
| 14 | recognize your signature or seal? |
| 15 | MR. COMYNS CARR: He doesn't have the earphone |
| 16 | on. |
| 17 | THE PRESIDENT: He used the word "recall" |
| 18 | again. He didn't understand it before; the interpreter |
| 19 | didn't understand it fully. |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

G 1 r € n 3 b e 4 r g 5 å 6 B 7 0 r 8 t 0 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Is that your signature or isn't it?

A I would not know unless I see the original.

(Whereupon, a paper was handed to
the witness.)

Q Look at that. Isn't that the envelope in which it was sent?

A Yes, though not written by me. It was written by somebody else. I should think it was written by my secretary.

Q Oh, I see. Now, what we have here -- rather, what has been shown to you is certified by the Japanese Foreign Office to be a letter of six pages, dated the 23rd of September, 1938 from you to Foreign Minister UGAKI; isn't it?

A As I recall now, I think that something of that kind might have happened, but I do not recall.

Q But isn't the document you have seen the original -- your original letter?

A I do not think so.

Q Why not?

A Because I do -- somehow I do not recall it.

Q I am not asking you to recall anything. I'm asking you whether the document you have been looking at is your letter with your seal on it.

A Yes.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Then I ask that it be received in evidence, your Honor. THE PRESIDENT: It took a long time to get that simple acknowledgment. It is admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 1835-A will receive exhibit No. 2437. 7 (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 2437 and received in evidence.) 10 MR. BROOKS: May the defense be furnished 11 copies of this document, your Honor? 12 THE PRESIDENT: We so direct. 13 MR. COMYNS CARR: And may the witness retain 14 either the original or a Japanese copy so that he 15 can follow? 16 THE PRESIDENT: Give him the original. He 17 has a copy. 18 (Whereupon, a paper was handed to 19 20 the witness.) MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading) 21 22 "23 September 1938 23 "From: General MINAMI, Jiro, Governor-24 General of Korea 25 His Excellency, the Toreign Minister "To:

UGAKI, Issei

"Sir:

"Approximately one year has passed since the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese Incident. Through the good policy of Your Excellency as Prime Minister" -- that is a mistake. It should be Foreign Minister -- "at a time when the situation is so extremely grave, the prestige of our country is being enhanced at home

and abroad, and I feel it is a matter for congratulations for the sake of our nation.

"Ever since the Incident our troops have been invincible, and I believe Hankow, the last capitol of the Chiang Regime, will soon be conquered.

"It is natural that the significance of the fall of Hankow, in this Holy War, will have an extremely great influence at home and abroad. I feel there are many measures to be taken by our nation at this juncture, but the most important problem, I believe, is the recognition of a pro-Japanese Regime in North and Central China simultaneously with the fall of Hankow, and to expound it at home and abroad.

"The recognition of a pro-Japanese Regime by our country will, internally, convince our people of the progress of our policy in China; and externally, give the Chinese masses a strong suggestion that there

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is no other way than to get rid of the Chiang Regime and depend on the new Regime, and at the same time the third powers behind Chiang will also fully realize that there is no other way than to approach the proJapanese regime in order to protect their own rights and interests. I believe it will have great effect at home and abroad.

"I feel Your Excellency has already given individual consideration to various measures to be taken after the fall of Hankow, but it is my wish to have Your Excellency make final judgment on this point.

"Yours respectfully"

THE MONITOR: During the reading, this witness said, "This is a fact."

BY M'. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Q Which part of it did you mean was a fact, General MINAMI?

A All of it.

Q Well, now, so you were communicating with ministers other than the Overseas Minister about Korean affairs, were you not?

A Yes.

Q And, so far from your war with China being the thing you were most against, as you told the interrogator, you were here supporting it, were you not?

6

7 8

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

22

24

25

A At the time I was interrogated, I did not have such a recollection. Having now seen such a letter, I realized that I might have sent a letter, and now I do confirm it. I was not constantly in negotiation or having dealings with other ministers.

Q Yes, but now about your statement to the interrogator that the thing you had been most against for fifteen years was the war with China. How do you reconcile that with this letter?

A I so replied at the time of the interrogation because it had always been my view that it was highly unfavorable and a disadvantage to fight a war with a neighboring country, namely China.

THE PRESIDENT: Why did you call it a "Holy War"?

THE WITNESS: I used the word because it was in wide currency at the time.

Q What was holy about it?

A I never thought about that very deeply. I used the word because it was in wide currency at that time among the general public. My idea was, it was not an aggressive war but hostilities which occurred by unavoidable circumstances.

Q This letter was written some nine or ten months after the rape of Nanking. You had heard all

about that, hadn't you?

A No.

It had created a most unfavorable sensation in the press of the whole world, hadn't it?

A Yes. There were reports in the press about that incident, but I did not receive any detailed reports on the matter.

Q Do you think that was holy?

THE PRESIDENT: In the great mass of evidence we received, I do not think the word "holy war" was used previously; but I am subject to correction.

Q General MINAMI, I notice that in your letter one point you are stressing very much is the recognition of a pro-Japanese regime in North and Central China. Now, that's just the very subject about which I've been asking you in the last three points I've been putting to you, and you've denied having anything to do with it.

A There is a difference in time. It is a different time entirely. There is no contradiction. This was said after the China Incident had already broken out. While Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army, it had been my policy to prevent any such occurence, and I did not even conceive of such an incident breaking out.

22

23

24

25

Now that you have seen this letter, do you think your recollection may have been wrong about the petition I asked you about, in July, 1937?

A 1937?

Q July, 1937. Didn't you join with UEDA in sending that petition to KONOYE?

A I had no connection with UEDA at all. He was with the Kwantung Army. I was in Korea.

Q Well, I'll leave that. Now, the next thing
I want to ask you about is this: On the 14th of Nay,
1941, while you were still Governor-General of Korea,
did you receive from Hitler the decoration of the
Grand Cross of the Eagle?

A Yes.

Is it right that you were only the third Japanese who had ever received it?

A I do not know whether I was the third or the fourth.

Q The other two being KONOYE and MATSUOKA; is that right?

A I have heard of that, but I do not know whether I was the third or fourth.

Q Now, what reason was given by Hitler for awarding you this decoration?

A I do not remember anything about a reason.

The decoration was brought to me by the German Consul General in Dairen.

THE PRESIDENT: You might read the citation to him if you have it.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I haven't it, your Honor.

- Q What do you think, yourself, you had done to earn this decoration from Hitler?
 - A It was strange to me.
 - Q Well, I'll leave it.

Now, while you were still Governor General of Korea, in March of 1942, I am referring to prosecution exhibit 1973, was ITAGAKI Commander-in-Chief of the Korean Army?

- A Yes.
- Q And was his Chief of Staff a man named IBARO?
- A Yes.
- Q Was IBARC a man in whom you had confidence?
- A Having no direct relationship with him, I would not say "confidence," but I knew him quite well.
 - Q As far as you know, is he a truthful person?
 - A Yes.
- Now, listen to this telegram from him to KINURA, Vice-Minister of War, on the 1st of March, 1942, exhibit 1973, prosecution document No. 980-A.

THE MONITOR: Mr. Comyns Carr, are you going

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to read the entire document?

MR. COMYNS CARR: The headings and the first paragraph.

Q (Continuing) "Army-Asia Secret,

"Received by the Army Secretariat, 4 March 1942

"Military Affairs Section"

Dated "1 March 1942, Secret Telegram - 2-28

"Operations Department, Korean Army

"Addressed to Vice Minister of Tar

"From the Chief of Staff of the Korean Army

"As it would be very effective in stamping out the respect and admiration of the Korean people for Britain and America, and also in establishing in them a strong faith in victory, and as the Governor-General and the Army are both strongly desirous of it, we wish you would intern 1,000 British and 1,000 American prisoners of war in Korea. We wish you would give us special consideration regarding this matter."

General MINAMI, was IBARO as truthful as usual when he said you were strongly desirous of this?

A Probably there was some talk between IBARO and the Chief of the Civilian Affairs -- the Director Ceneral of Civilian Affairs, but I think the word "desirous" is too strong a word. The opinion was given that there was no objection to prisoners of war

7 8

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

coming to Korea.

And the object, as stated in this document, of sending them there, page 3, paragraph numbered 1:

"Purpose: It is our purpose by interning American and British prisoners of war In Korea, to make the Koreans realize positively the true might of our Empire as well as to contribute to psychological propaganda work for stamping out any ideas of worship of Europe and America which the greater part of Korea still retains at bottom."

And on page 4,"The main points to be put into force:

"(1) Prisoners of war, with the exception of warrant officers and above, will be used in various sorts of work in the principal cities of Korea, especially where psychological conditions are not good in order to achieve the ends mentioned under I."

You knew very well, did you not, that those were the objects of sending prisoners of war to Korea?

A There was no very definite objective as just said. It was only that there were no objections to prisoners of war being brought into Korea. Such matters were outside the scope of my work -- such concrete matters.

Whalen & Duda

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Did the Chief of Staff inform you that KIMURA had agreed to the proposal except that he suggested that the buildings in which it was proposed to put the prisoners of war were too good?

A No. Isn't that a negotiation as carried on between the Chief of Staff and the Vice Minister of War?

Q Yes, and I am asking you whether the Chief of Staff didn't inform you of the result?

- A What do you mean by Chief of Staff?
- Q IBARA.
- A No. IBARA was not under my direct command.
- Who was suggested he was. But I have asked you the question whether he told you the result.
 - A He did not.
 - Q Did anybody?
 - A Yes, I heard.
- Q From whom?

A It was said that there were no buildings in which to accommodate prisoners of war, and the Government General was asked whether he couldn't do anything about providing buildings, and, therefore, school buildings were just suggested by an official in the Government General, and the report on that matter was brought to my attention.

Q Namely, the report that the War Minister and

the Vice War Minister thought they were too good for prisoners of war?

A That I did not hear.

Q Did you find worse ones to comply with their desires?

A That is not a work to be done by the Government General.

Q Now, the prisoners didn't arrive until after you had left Korea. Did you know what happened on their arrival?

A I have not heard anything of it.

Q I will leave that, then. Now, when you got back to Japan in May, 1942, you became & Privy Councilor, didn't you?

A Yes.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I am now referring to prosecution exhibit 687, your Honor.

Q Did you attend a series of meetings of the council held between the 9th of October -- held almost continuously from the 9th to the 21st of October, 1942, about the Greater East Asia Ministry?

A I attended those meetings.

23

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q Yes. And was Admiral SUZUKI the committee chief?

A Yes.

Q And on the 20th of October 1942, page 19 of the exhibit, did you hear him say -- state to the effect -- did you hear him state to the effect that this draft was not based upon the rules of righteousness but upon the rules of might? Do you remember that as reported--

THE MONITOR: Just a moment, please. We have to find the equivalent parts in the Japanese text, otherwise it is absolutely impossible to give an accurate interpretation.

MR. COMYNS CARR: It is the last of the meetings on the 20th of October, page 19 of the English, the third paragraph from the end.

THE MONITOR: Thank you, sir.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May I repeat?

THE MONITOR: Yes, please.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The paragraph in question is the third from the end of the last meeting on the 20th of October, and it begins, "Committee Chief SUZUKI stated to the effect--"

A Yes, I do remember that he said something to that effect.

2

4

. 3

5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23 24

Q Did you agree with him?

A Yes.

Q Nevertheless when Premier TOJO insisted on the draft being adopted did you in common with all the members of the Privy Council agree to it?

A I did not express any views or opinions, but as an individual I was opposed to the establishment of of the Ministry for Greater East Asiatic Affairs.

Q But did you acquiesce in it in spite of your opinion?

A Because of the fact that many Privy Councilors from the diplomatic field voiced opinions opposing the plan, there was no need for me to add my opinions opposing the plan.

My foremost reason for opposing the establishment of this ministry was--

Q Stop him. I haven't asked any question at all about that, General MINAMI. I don't care what your reasons for it were.

THE PRESIDENT: We must have what he said.

A (Continuing) My foremost reason for opposing the establishment of the new ministry was that there was no reason why such a ministry should be established when there was already a Ministry for Foreign Affairs, that it was a case of building one house on top of

2 3

1

5

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

another.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Spratt & Yelden

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Q General MINAMI, did you realize that the Privy Council had a duty to give its honest advice to the Emperor, whatever the Government might think?

A Yes.

Q And was attention drawn to that fact in this very meeting by Councilors ISHII and OBATA?

A Yes.

Q Nevertheless, did you, in common with the other councilors, pass this measure because the government insisted upon it, although you were opposed to it?

A Generally speaking, the Privy Council does not directly interfere in the policy of the government. At times the Privy Council expresses its views and advice on government draft of plans, but it does not absolutely oppose the government. Therefore, counsel is given on the government plans in order to avoid any possible mistakes or errors, and generally speaking it is the custom of the Privy Council to pass upon a plan, if it is not harmful, by the vote of the majority, and if possible by a unanimous vote. And, therefore, as OBATA and others

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

25

views expressing individual opposition, eventually in the last plenary session the plan was passed.

said, although there would be individual opposition --

Q And all the time you were a Privy Councilor did you obediently pass all the measures the government brought before you?

With regard to this question, later on, after the resignation of the TOJO Cabinet, the KOISO Cabinet came into being, and I had occasion to express my felicitations to one of my co-defendants, the then Foreign Minister SHIGEMITSU, upon his concurrent investiture as Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister for Greater East Asiatic Affairs, Mr. SHIGEMITSU thanking me for my words of congratulations. The reason for my congratulating Mr. SHIGE-MITSU at that time was that at last by his holding the two offices concurrently diplomacy had at last come into its own again -- to its former position of unity -- and that this was fully in keeping with the expression of opposition that I had made previously: that the creation of a new ministry was nothing more than trying to butter bread on both sides -- opposition view that I held. Thereupon, Mr. SHIGEMITSU immediately thanked me for the words that I had expressed to him. That is all.

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, did you attend a meeting of the Privy Council on the 18th of August, 1943? That is exhibit 1275. I do not remember the date, but during my tenure of office I attended all meetings of the Privy Council. Yes. Now, this was a meeting at which the Council approved a treaty between Japan and Thailand, as you called it, by which parts of Malaya were handed over to Thailand? A Yes. Now, there was another MINAMI who was a member of the Council besides yourself, wasn't there? Yes. Was it you or he who asked a question at that meeting as to whether this treaty was proper under international law? A That was MINAMI, Hiromu.

Q Did you hear TOJO answer to the effect -the last sentence in the paragraph on page 3. It
begins, "Then MINAMI, a member of the committee."
I am only reading the last sentence -- I had better
read the whole of that paragraph, I am sorry:

"Then MINAMI, a member of the committee, inquired what meaning such an action would have by International Law. MORIYAMA, Director of the Bureau of Legislation, replied that it was the popular opinion according to International Law that occupying nations had no territorial rights in occupied areas, and therefore such treaties for territorial cession in the occupied area should not be concluded. However, on the other hand, as an occupying nation was conducting the administration for occupied areas, in other words, military administration, and as there was no special regulation stipulating that we should continue this condition forever, it should be perfectly all right to agree that there would be no objections to our abolishing the military administration in the occupied area and letting a third power annex such territories. He explained that the treaty between Japan and Thailand would be concluded in this spirit. A reply was made by Premier TOJO to the effect that the Japanese Army already firmly believed that this was

24

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Japan's territory and that the measure for this draft should be taken according to this firm conviction."

And then on page 4, the first paragraph beginning:

whether the Government intended to consider such measures provided in the Treaty as not being contrary to International Law. Premier TOJO answered that International Law should be observed so long as the enemy observed it; but that International Law should be interpreted from the viewpoint of executing the war according to our own opinions, and that he considered the present measure as being perfectly justified by International Law."

Now, General MINAMI, you have told us that you were a respector of international law.

Should I repeat my question?

- A Please; briefly, please.
- Q You have told us that you were a respector of international law, have you not?
 - A Yes.
- Q Were you shocked by those remarks of MORIYAMA and TOJO?
 - A I wasn't particularly shocked but I might

3

5

6

9

10

11 12

13

14

16

18

19

21

22

23 24

2

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be saying something quite strange here but it happens that I am very hard of hearing and that unless a person in the Privy Council meetings came next to me and spoke to me into my ears, otherwise I was sort of a deaf-mute and I maintained a policy of silence; and it was usual for me to not know what the question was all about until after the transcript had been put in writing.

- Q Did you see this transcript in writing?
- A Yes.
- Q Were you shocked then?
- A No.
- Q May we take it then that your ideas about international law are similar to those?
 - A Yes.
- Q Now, only one other subject I want to ask you about and that is this Greater Japan Political Society. When the IRAA, Imperial Rule Assistance Association, was formed all the political parties were abolished, were they not?
 - A Yes.
 - Q That was in Prince KONOYE's time?
 - A I think that was so.
- Assistance Political Society formed; is that right?

| 1 | A No, not so. |
|-----|--|
| 2 | Q What do you say is the correct fact about that? |
| 3 | A Not the Imperial Rule Assistance Political |
| 5 | Society but the Japan Political Association was forme |
| 6 | on March 30, 1945. |
| 7 | Q Yes, but I am asking you about the Imperial |
| 8 | Rule Assistance Political Society. I should have |
| 9 | said May, 1942. |
| 10 | A That is something of which I am absolutely |
| 11 | unfamiliar. That is because I was then in Korea. |
| 12 | When the Greater Japan Political Association |
| 13 | was formed in March, 1945, was it not formed because |
| 14 | there had been troubles in those two other societies |
| 15 | and they were both abolished and replaced by your society? |
| 17 | A I don't know the meaning but the Japan |
| 18 | Political Association was formed after the dissolution |
| 9 | of the Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society to |
| 0.0 | take the place of that society. |
| 2 | Q And also of the Imperial Rule Assistance |
| 3 | Association? |
| 4 | A That is an entirely separate question. |
| 5 | Political matters were handled by the Imperial Rule |

Assistance Political Society but the Imperial Rule

Assistance Association was a completely different organization.

Q Did it not cease to exist at the same time?

A I do not think at the same time. I think it was dissolved a little later Eventually it was dissolved.

And from the time when your Society was formed was it not the only association of the kind that was permitted to exist in Japan?

A Yes.

Q And were you not appointed its president by or at the suggestion of the government?

A That is not so.

Q Who did appoint you?

A Influential representatives of various political circles and parties such as the Minseito and the Seiyukai recommended me as president of the association; that is, people who were for a long time active in politics.

Q But I thought you agreed with me that those two bodies and all other political parties had been abolished some years before?

A That is so; however, what I said was that I was recommended to the office by various representative people of various political circles. They don't belong

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

G d b e r 8 K a 13 merely -- they were not merely former members of the Minseito or Seiyukai but various other political parties and groups as well.

"as your appointment approved by the government?

There was no connection between me and A the government.

After your society came into being, did it do both the work that had formerly been done by the Imperial Rule Assistance Association and the work that had formerly been done by the Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society?

The work was entirely different.

O Well, now, I want to read to you what you said in your interrogation, exhibit 2207, page 2, and I shall be reading from the second question on that page to the bottom of the page.

"O General, you stated that you were a member and President of the Greater Japan Political Asseciation?

"A Yes.

"Q Now tell me: How long were you a member of this society? I want the dates.

"A From 30 March 1944 until 15 August 1945.

"O Now, you said that one of the principal

3 4 5

1

2

6 7

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

aims of this society was to extend the Greater 1 Fast Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere? 2 "A Essentially that might be termed one of 3 its principal aims ... 4 "n How far did you want to extend this Co-5 Prosperity Sphere? To what geographical limits? 6 "A Exactly as the Government had outlined. 7 8 "O How was that? 9 "A Asiatics. "O To extend it over all Asia? 10 11 "A Yes. "O Under that you include India, Burma, the 12 13 Dutch Indies and the Philippines? 14 "A Yes. "O You weren't concerned with how the proper 15 16 sovereignties felt about India, Burma, the Dutch 17 Indies, China, or the Philippines? 18 "A Yes, I believed that Asiatics wished to 19 be freed of the yoke of foreign domination. 20 "O General, you believed, then, in Asia for 21 Asiatics? 22 "A Yes." 23

THE WITNESS: There were two big mistakes in the passages just read.

"hat are they?

24

A I think the first mistake was made by the interpreter at the time. The correct date is 30th of March 1945; the Japanese text gives 1944. Now it seems that I am made to have said that India was included, but at the time of the interrogation I laid particular emphasis on the point that India was not included. Those are the two mistakes.

o why did you lay emphasis on that point, as you say you did?

A I wanted to make clear the mistake that appears in this interrogatory, because when the prosecutor asked me the question ""as India included?" I twice said "No"; and in spite of that, that mistake continued to appear in this document. That is why I pointed out that mistake. The period in which I served as president of the Japan Political Association is a very important one and that is why I took special occasion now to point out the mistake; and after hearing the document read, that mistake was just as I had anticipated.

I said that the date was very important because I held this office less than half a year, only about five months up to -- before and up to the termination of the war.

General, you said that you believed

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Asiatics wished to be freed of the yoke of foreign domination. Did you believe that they wished to 2 exchange it for the yoke of Japanese domination? 3

> A That is not so, absolutely not so, because the past history of these countries was one of influence and domination by other outside Western Powers. I said that they should be liberated and that is how I believed.

- O Did you think that they wished to exchange it for a system such as that which prevailed in Manchukuo?
 - A That wasn't my idea.
 - o "hy not?
- A My point was that Asia should be freed and free. I had no idea in my mind of connecting Manchukuo with this matter, that is, to follow the pattern set in Manchukuo.
- O But I thought you told me that Manchukuo was independent and equal.
- A Yes, I always had the belief -- entertained the belief that Manchukuo was a peaceful area in the Orient.

MR. COMYNS CARR: That concludes my crossexamination, your Honor.

24

Asiatics wished to be freed of the yoke of foreign domination. Did you believe that they wished to exchange it for the yoke of Japanese domination?

That is not so, absolutely not so, because the past history of these countries was one of influence and domination by other outside Western Powers. I said that they should be liberated and that is how I believed.

O Did you think that they wished to exchange it for a system such as that which prevailed in Manchukuo?

- A That wasn't my idea.
- o why not?

A My point was that Asia should be freed and free. I had no idea in my mind of connecting Manchukuo with this matter, that is, to follow the pattern set in Manchukuo.

O But I thought you told me that Manchukuo was independent and equal.

A Yes, I always had the belief -- entertained the belief that Manchukuo was a peaceful area in the Orient.

MR. COMYNS CARR: That concludes my crossexamination, your Honor.

24

1

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE PRESIDENT: I have a number of questions to put on behalf of a Member of the Tribunal. I may have other such questions. Whether a question by a Member of the Tribunal can be objected to and ought to be objected to are matters to be decided in Court. I have not read these questions, and I assume there is nothing objectionable in them; but they should be put before the re-examination.

BY THE PRESIDENT:

Mitness, in exhibits 691 and 703 are mentioned operation plans called "otsu", thirteen plans which were made for a war against the U.S.S.R. and plans "Hei-C" plan against China. Who made the plan "otsu" when you were Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army and who adopted the plan "otsu" for the Kwantung Army while you were in command of it?

MR. BROOKS: Mr. President, can we have the witness shown those exhibits on a matter of that importance so there is no mistake?

THE PRESIDENT: Show him the exhibits, please.

(Whereupon, some documents were handed to the witness.)

A May I reply? Operations plans are made in the General Staff Headquarters annually in peacetime

and in accordance with conditions and situations in wartime; and those operations plans are shown to all divisional commanders and other commanders throughout the country. The various armies formulate their own plan of operations by applying the general staff plan so that they would be in accordance with each other. And I believe that the plans as shown on the photostats which I have seen were studies made on the basis of those plans.

THE PRESIDENT: Who made the plan "otsu" and who adopted the plan "otsu"?

A In the Kwantung Army the Kwantung Army plan of operations was formulated by the staff officer in charge of operations in accordance with the plan of the General Staff; but I do not know who did it -- who made it. If the matter is looked into, I should think it was formulated by the staff officer in charge of operations in the Kwantung Army.

Q Who adopted it?

THE INTERPRETER: The Witness is asking may he be shown those documents again?

(Whereupon, some documents were handed to the witness.)

A While I was in the post of Commanding General

4

5

7

9

10

12

13

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

23

24

of the Kwantung Army I think the staff officer in charge of operations plan was replaced once, and so there were two men. Well, I can't tell by looking at these photostats, but in any event the plan was drawn up by the staff officer in charge of operations in the Kwantung Army in accordance with the principles as laid down by the General Staff Headquarters in Tokyo.

Q I asked who adopted the plan. I have got no answer that I have heard.

Who adopted the plan?

A In the Kwantung Army it is naturally the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army who carries out such responsibility.

Q Do you know well the terms of the Portsmouth Agreement concluded in 1905 between Russia and Japan?

A I am not familiar.

Q Are you familiar with the contents of the Pekin Convention of 1925?

A I do not know.

Q Do you know that Japan under the Portsmouth Treaty considered Manchuria an integral part of the Chinese territory?

A I should think -- I think that there was something of that nature.

 Q Article Three of the Portsmouth Treaty reads: "Russia and Japan undertake to evacuate completely and simultaneously Manchuria except the territory upon which extends the least of the Liaotung Peninsula.." Do you know that?

A Yes.

Q "..and to restore to the rule of China wholly and completely all the parts of the Man-churian territory that are at present occupied by Russian or Japanese troops or under their control."

Did you know that?

A Japan was not in occupation of Manchukuo.

In accordance with the Japan-Manchukuo protocol

Japan merely stationed her troops there.

Q Do you believe now and did you believe earlier that Manchuria constitutes an integral part of China and that any violation of the economic and territorial integrity of Manchuria is a violation of the sovereign rights of China?

A Because the State of Manchukuo was founded in accordance with the will and wishes of the people of Manchuria, the idea was that it was separate from China and that is how I now believe.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half-past one.

```
(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was
           taken.)
6
7
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1330.

Wollf & Morse

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Counsellor OKAMOTO.

JIRO MINAMI, one of the accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows

MR. T. OKAMOTO: There has been a mistake which I should like to call to the attention of the Tribunal. May I speak in Japanese so that the accused may hear?

attention was called to exhibit 691 and 703, but the actual document which was shown the accused was 698, photostats, document 698. I should like to have the witness be shown the documents actually in question in its original. Especially with reference to exhibit 703 I should like to ask the witness to give special attention to the second from the last question on the sixth page of the Japanese text, and I should also like to have the witness give particular attention in

3

4

5

7 8

10

11

9

12

13

14

15 16

17

20

19

23

22

24

exhibit 691 to the name of the sender and to the name of the one giving instructions to the sender.

THE PRESIDENT: Vell, let him look at exhibit 691 and then 703.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were handed to the witness.)

THE PRESIDENT: The second to the last question on page 6 of the Japanese text.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: Speaking about page 6 of the Japanese text, I am referring to Japanese copies but not the original so may I show him the copy?

THE WITNESS: I did not quite understand. Will the interpreter repeat that last statement.

("hereupon, the last statement was reinterpreted.)

THE WITNESS: Now I understand. I understand now.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, have you anything to add to your previous answers?

THE WITNESS: The operations plans which were referred to this morning I did not quite understand at the time. Now that I have seen these documents I now understand that these were operations plans of the time when I was Commander in Chief of the Kwantung Army. This is a plan formulated by the general staff

MINAMI

headquarters, and the plan itself was actually drawn up by the Chief of the Division of Operations of the staff headquarters, and following that received the Imperial sanction. That is all.

BY THE PRESIDENT:

Q Look once more at exhibit 698.

MR. BROOKS: Did the Court say 698? He has 691 in his hands, sir.

Q (Continuing) Did you read that document for the first time in 1928 when you were vice-chief of the Army General Staff?

A I do not recall that.

Q Do you regard as lawful from the viewpoint of international law the actions of a state, a neighbor of China, which, without the consent of the Chinese Government and eventually against its will, would seize Manchuria with the help of its troops and establish control there regardless of the reasons for doing so, whether to support the independence movement or to create a military base for the defense against another state?

A To do so with the help of another country, that I feel is unlawful. But it is my interpretation that if the State of Manchukuo is founded in accordance with the will and desire of the people of Manchukuo

that is an internal affair of Manchuria which is outside the scope of our function. It is a matter with which we cannot interfere in.

Q Do not such actions constitute a violation of the territorial integrity of another state?

A It would be in violation of international law if Manchuria declared its independence from China with Japanese help and the help of Japanese troops.

THE INTERPRETER: "ith the help of a foreign country, in this case Japan and Japanese troops.

Q Do you believe now that Japan violated the Portsmouth Treaty when its troops marched into Manchuria against the will of the Chinese Government?

A No.

Q Did you attend the conference of the Privy Council on the 12th of October, 1942 when TOJO as Premier in answer to a question asked by UENO stated that all the territories occupied by the Japanese troops would be incorporated into the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere and that the latter would expand along with conquests?

A May I have the date repeated?

Q The 12th of October, 1942.

A Yes, now I understand. As I have said before, because I was extremely hard of hearing I saw the minutes of these meetings in writing afterwards. I then thought, when I saw the record of the proceedings in writing, that it was a little extreme but I was not particularly shocked by it -- I was not greatly shocked by it.

Q Do you adhere to the viewpoint on Greater East Asia and do you support the idea that Japan ought to rule over all the nations that make part of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere?

A I do not.

Q How do you regard this doctrine now as well as the policy of Japan, the aim of which is that Japan should rule over the whole world and that the Japanese Emperor should be Emperor of the whole world?

MR. BROOKS: Mr. President, before the
Tribunal gets too far from the question asked about
what was said at the committee meeting, I believe
the prosecutor brought out that that was Hiromu
MINAMI. It was not clear. He questioned the witness
on that and I don't think the witness understood your
question. I think he said he was shocked by it.
Would the Court mind before leaving that clearing
the point up if that is true?

THE PRESIDENT: He said he read it and he was not greatly shocked.

MR. BROOKS: I definitely understood the President to ask if he made the statement though, and that was what the prosecutor was clearing up.

THE PRESIDENT: No, I did not.

MR. BROOKS: I misunderstood you, sir. I am sorry, I misunderstood your question.

THE PRESIDENT: Will you answer the last question, please. The Japanese shorthand writer will

O

repeat it, please.

(Whereupon, the last question was read by the Japanese Court Reporter.)

A I think that it is entirely wrong. The idea of ruling the world is an entirely mistaken notion.

Q Well, the next question I had to ask is based on the assumption that you answered other questions in a certain way, so I am not asking it.

MR. BROOKS: Are there any further questions, your Honor?

THE PRESIDENT: That is all.

mm. BROOKS: As I understand under our rules of procedure if any other counsel has any cross-examination of this witness as a hostile witness it should be done now; otherwise, that after the redirect -- the general redirect examination, if the witness is treated as not a hostile witness but there are matters specifically relating to his client not covered by the general redirect examination, that they will follow at that time; is that correct, your Honor? I am referring to paragraph five of our rules of procedure, your Honor. That is our understanding.

THE PRESIDENT: I will read paragraph five: "Upon the completion of all cross-examination,

without the special permission of the Tribunal, redirect examination shall be conducted by the counsel who conducted the general direct examination." MR. PROOKS: I will send the Language section up my copy of that, your Holor. If you want to read the rest of it it will save time. THE PRESIDENT: (Reading continued) "Other sounsel for individual accused may

examine a witnes.; on redirect examination only on matters speci: 'ically relating to his client and not covered by the general redirect examination."

r

n b

> r g

&

B

0

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BROOKS: We also asked in court the other day that, where the English affidavit is read by the American counsel, the Japanese counsel be allowed to handle the redirect examination. I do not care for American counsel to handle the redirect examination since Mr. OKAMOTO, the Japanese counsel for the witness MINAMI, has requested that he be allowed to handle the redirect examination. I will not examine. I will turn it over to him, if the Court so judges. (Whereupon, a discussion off the record was had by the Members of the Tri-

bunal.)

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court allows counsellor OKAMOTO to reexamine.

MR. BROOKS: Thank you, your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. T. OKAMOTO:

General MINAMI, are you able to hear my voice?

> Yes. A

This morning, in answering, you said quite often that "I do not remember well." When you said that, were you speaking in Kansai dialect and thus meant "I do not remember at all," or did you mean

E.

that "I did not remember very well -- remember little but not remember very well."?

THE PRESIDENT: What he said was very clear. It is not ambiguous. He is not at liberty to explain the obvious.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: In Japanese there are many dialects, and I wanted to make that quite clear; but I shall turn this matter over to the Language Section.

Q The President of the Tribunal asked you about the Portsmouth Treaty. Now, the stationing of troops in Manchuria, was that in accordance with the Portsmouth Treaty or not -- or any other treaty, do you know?

A I thought that it was in accordance with the Portsmouth Treaty.

Q At this point I would like to call the attention of the Tribunal to exhibit 2298 -- prosecution document No. 2298.

(In English) No: Exhibit No. I shall read it:

"ADDITIONAL ARTICLES" to the Portsmouth Treaty, defense document No. 59. I shall read just a paragraph:

"ADDITIONAL ARTICLES Signed at Portsmouth, September 5, 1905."

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

Paragraph 3 of item 1:

"The High Contracting Parties reserve to themselves the right to maintain guards to protect their respective railway lines in Manchuria. The number of such guards shall not exceed fifteen per kilometre and within that maximum number, the commanders of the Japanese and Russian Armies shall, by common accord, fix the number of such guards to be employed, as small as possible having in view the actual requirements."

What you have just referred to, witness, as the Portsmouth Treaty, was it this or something else?

THE MONITOR: Was it this provision or some other provision?

A That is what I thought of -- that provision.

Q In answer to an interrogation by the prosecution you said that you could have stopped the actions of the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army; but, in actuality, in reality, you could not.

THE MONITOR: The first part is not "you could have," but "I could stop it, but I could not stop it."

Q How much could you limit the actions of the Kwantung Army as War Minister?

THE RESIDENT: That is already covered.

9

2

3

4

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

MR. T. OKAMOTO: I think that the enswer to that question is very unclear and contradictory, so I wish to have it made clear. The Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army could be restrained in case his actions were contrary to government policy and by denying -- or when they wasted expenditures. I could not understand very well your second

answer -- second point.

That is, the War Minister rejects giving funds to the Kwantung Army for -- to carry on its A actions.

THE MONITOR: Mr. President, we have translated as accurately as we can the witness' reply. However, it is not logical -- I mean, the enswer is not logical.

THE PRESIDENT: Give his answer. We are not concerned about the logic of it yet.

I shall change the wording of the cuestion. THE PRESIDENT: Give his answer. We are the judges of logic, not the interpreters.

THE MONITOR: I meant by "logic", it is untranslatable into a regular sentence.

THE PRESIDENT: Make the best you can of it. THE MONITOR: Yes, sir.

2

3

5

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

> 16 17

> > 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

3

5

7 8

9

11

13

15 16

17

20

21

19

22

24

25

to that question is very unclear and contradictory, so I wish to have it made clear.

Mi. T. OKAMOTO: I think that the answer

A The Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army could be restrained in case his actions were contrary to government policy and by denying -- or when they wasted expenditures.

Q I could not understand very well your second answer -- second point.

A That is, the War Minister rejects giving funds to the Kwantung Army for -- to carry on its actions.

THE MONITOR: Mr. President, we have translated as accurately as we can the witness' reply. However, it is not logical -- I mean, the answer is not logical.

THE PRESIDENT: Give his answer. We are not concerned about the logic of it yet.

Q I shall change the wording of the question.

THE PRESIDENT: Give his answer. We are
the judge of logic, not the interpreters.

THE MONITOR: I meant by "logic," it is untranslatable into a regular sentence.

THE PRESIDENT: Make the best you can of it.
THE MONITOR: Yes, sir.

A The Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army -the actions of the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung
Army can be controlled or restrained in case such
action is contrary to government policy by denying --

THE MONITOR: "Can be controlled or when the Kwantung Army denies the expenditure." And Japanese counsel followed that by "What did you mean by that? Who denies that?" And the witness replied, "The Kwantung Army -- the War Minister denies it." That is all, sir.

Q Was the War Minister a superior officer to Commander-in-Chief HONJO?

A The War Minister is not a superior officer of the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army, but he has the right of command in connection with matters pertaining to personnel, expenditures and with regard to the enforcement of discipline and morals.

THE MONITOR: Not "the right of command," but "the right to take part in the disposition of matters with regard to personnel, discipline and morals and expenditures.

A (Continuing) In other words, he has the power to participate in the disposal of matters pertaining to military administration.

Q With regard to the action taken by Commander-

4 5

4

6

8

9

11 12

13

him?

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

22 23

24

25

in-Chief HONJO on the night of the 18th of September, could you, as War Minister, be in the position to deal with it or not -- were you in any position to punish the commanding general or not?

A The incident which occurred on the night of September 18, being an unexpected and sudden one, the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army carried out his duties and exercised the right of self defense. In view of that fact, he was not punished.

Q Did you have the authority to punish him?

A No.

THE PRESIDENT: Why did the Emperor punish

Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The witness told me quite clearly that he could have recalled General HONJO, but he didn't because he approved of his action. In view of that, I must object to an attempt to get him to change his answer.

THE PRESIDENT: The function or the purpose of redirect examination is not to eliminate contradictions but to remove obscurities.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: Yes, your Honor.

Q In answer to an interrogation by the prosecution you said you approved of the actions of General

4

6

8

10 11

13

14

16 17

18

19 20

22

23

matter?

A The commanding general of the Korean Army, being an official of the Shinnin rank, the War

HONJO. Now, did you mean that you approved of his actions as War Minister or that the government approved -- that the cabinet approved of his actions.

THE PRESIDENT: That was not left in doubt.

Q Why did you approve of the actions of General HONJO?

A It was recognized because the Kwantung Army was, as much as possible, acting in accordance with the government's policy of non-extension of the incident and because, in accordance with his official responsibilities, was exercising its right of self defense; and this was recognized both by the government and by the Supreme Command.

Q After the Commander-in-Chief of the Chosen Korean Army -- that is, the army -- the Chosen Army crossed the border of Chosen, did the Commander-in-Chief of the Chosen Army send any message of that effect to Tokyo?

A Yes, he made a settlement of the matter voluntarily. He sent to the Emperor an inquiry whether he should remain or resign.

What steps were taken with regard to that

Minister does not have any authority to punish him.

That is, in other words, he was an official of the rank -- was personally appointed by the Emperer.

And, with regard to his actions, the Emperor personally reprimanded him.

THE PRESIDENT: A colleague would like the following question to be put: As the Emperor approved the sending of troops from Korea to Manchuria, was the government able to refuse funds for paying the expense?

THE WITNESS: If sanctioned, the government could not but approve of expenditures -- could not prevent the defraying of expenditures.

Q With regard to the crossing of the Chosen border by Chosen Army, was this under the command of the Supreme Command or the War Ministry --

THE MONITOR: No: With regard to the expenditure incurred in the crossing of the border, was this expenditure approved by the Supreme Command or by you -- requested by the Supreme Command or by you, the War Minister?

A Requests for such funds are made by the Chief of the Army General Staff. But, in connection with the funds, the War Minister inquires of the Chief of Staff and ascertains the amount of money

7 8

required for any particular purpose. And, after obtaining such information, the War Minister brings the matter up to the meeting of the cabinet, and there the matter is thoroughly deliberated upon and thrashed out.

The matter was reported by the War Minister to the cabinet and there asked for the Prime Minister's approval. The amount approved, as I now recall, for that purpose was drawn from the second reserve fund, and the amount was nine million, six hundred thousand yen.

Q Who was it, during the cabinet session, urged that a League Commission of Inquiry be invited to Manchuria; who were the people?

A That was Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA. And, first of all, Beron SHIDEHARA asked me, "What do you think of the idea?" I agreed with Baron SHIDEHARA heartily on the plan and said that I welcomed the coming of the inquiry commission, the reason being that, as far as I was concerned, we should not create any misunderstanding abroad that Japan was engaged in something — that Japan was up to something in Manchuria and that it was highly proper if members of the League of Nations could come personally to see the actual conditions on the spot. The dabinet

5

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Duda & Whalen

Q Wasn't there anyone who objected to this plan?

A No one opposed.

Q With regard to the dispatch of troops to Chientao, was that in accordance with your order as War Minister, or by the order of the Chief of the Army General Staff?

A The dispatch of troops to Chientao was done in accordance with an Imperial command order by the Chief of the Army General Staff. But actually I requested the Chief of Staff to do so; that is, I, too, requested the Chief of Staff to do so. I counseled the Chief of the Army General Staff because I felt it was highly necessary for the maintenance of law and order in Chientao inasmuch as the majority of the population, that is to say about sixty per cent of the entire population of Chientao was composed of Koreans.

THE MONITOR: Over sixty per cent.

Q Do you remember the number of troops?

A Being in accordance with peace time organization, one company of peace time organization, I should think the number was somewhere between 120 to 130 men.

Q You said that you had heard many rumors concerning ITAGAKI and ISHIWARA. Did you ever conduct an investigation to see if these rumors were true or not?

A Yes, I did.

What kind of investigation?

A The investigation was carried on with an extremely careful attitude, and consultations were previously held on the matter with the Chief of the Army General Staff. One is that NINOMIYA, Vice-Chief of Staff -- a party made a trip with Vice-Chief of Staff NINOMIYA as its head, a party of experts headed by NINOMIYA, Vice-Chief of Staff.

Another party of investigation was ordered by me with its leader being General SHIRAKAWA.

I personally ordered another investigation party headed by Major General HASHIMOTO, Toranosuke, including various capable representatives from the War Ministry, the Army General Staff office, and the Inspectorate General of Military Education.

Q What were the results of that investigation?

A With regard to the NINOMIYA investigation party
I did not personally and directly get any reports because it was a general staff investigation into the
combat actions of the Kwantung Army, and a study of its
operational actions in Manchuria.

The report made by the investigation parties headed by HASHIMOTO and by SHIRAKAWA, the other party by SHIRAKAWA, was that the rumors which were afloat in Japan that the army on the spot was ignoring the

2 5

policies and intentions of the central authorities, or that the younger officers in the Kwantung Army were treating its commanding general as a robot, or that ITAGAKI, ISHIHARA and other staff officers were taking arbitrary action, that all of these rumors were without foundation.

,

Q As War Minister, had you ever sent out instructions concerning the establishment of a new regime in Manchuria?

A My recollection is that after consulting with Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA, both of us sent instructions to Manchuria, Baron SHIDEHARA sending instructions to Japanese diplomatic organs in Manchuria, and I to the army authorities in Manchuria, to the effect that Japanese, all Japanese, whether of the army, whether of the government or civilians in general, should not at all interfere in the internal affairs or movements in Manchuria -- interfere or participate.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Will my friend be so good as to ask the witness which HASHIMOTO he was referring to in the answers he gave a few minutes ago?

My friend tells me that the witness did make it clear which HASHIMOTO it was and it is not the accused.

Your Honor, with regard to the last question about sending instructions to Manchuria, that has already been stated in examination in chief and in cross-examination. In my submission it is mere repetition to go into it again.

Q In answer to the interrogation of the prosecution, you said that on August 26 you had sent no instructions to that effect -- on September 26.

Is there no mistake about that?

RED IRECT

Me by the prosecutor -- that is, I heard the question put to me by the questioner as being related to the monarchial restoration movement in Manchuria, and I said that was not so. It being a very important question, I held very careful consultations with Baron SHIDEHARA on the matter and we wired instructions to our subordinates and representatives in Manchuria, stating implicitly that Japanese must not interfere in the internal movements of Manchuria and that no military administration should be established.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Spratt & Yelden

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Witness, before the recess you mentioned your association with SHIDEHARA in connection with the Manchurian Incident. You heard General TANAKA give evidence in this court. Did you hear him say this:

"I think it was in the fall of 1935 General MINAMI told me that about the time of the Manchurian Incident he had given expression to a positive opinion with respect to Manchuria reflecting the attitude of the entire army. As a result of this expression of army opinion MINAMI had come into loggerheads with Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA who maintained a passive attitude resulting in friction which extended even to their personal emotions."

That appears at page 2019 of the transcript. Continuing on page 2020 TANAKA said:

"General MINAMI said that Foreign Minister
SHIDEHARA maintained a very passive attitude with
respect to the settlement of various pending issues
involving Manchuria. On the contrary, General MINAMI
representing army opinion advocated a decisive settlement of the pending issues from the standpoint of
national defense. Because of that fact, whether before

4 5

the incident or after the incident, these two men were opposed and constant friction existed between them."

What have you to say to that evidence of General TANAKA?

THE WITNESS: Before replying to that question from the President may I add a few words to another point which I have failed to explain before?.

THE PRESIDENT: I prefer you to answer that question from me.

THE WITNESS: I deny the TANAKA testimony.

That testimony is based entirely upon imagination and TANAKA's personal opinions. The fact is that there was no opposition between SHIDEHARA and me. At that time there was considerable propaganda by the press and by popular rumors in Manchuria that the army was positive and SHIDEHARA passive. Actually at no time was there any friction or controversy between SHIDEHARA and me and even to this day we maintain friendly relations, friendly personal relations. The TANAKA testimony is completely groundless. It is based entirely on personal opinions and imaginations of his own. I deny it completely.

THE PRESIDENT: Now complete your answer to the question put to you just before the recess.

with the statement I made that I had asked the Chief of the Army General Staff as to how much money was necessary for the dispatch of forces. I am making this additional remark because the impression might have been given because of my lack of sufficient explanation that perhaps the Chief of the Army General Staff brought the matter to the attention of the Throne and received the Imperial sanction thereon. The Emperor does not grant Imperial sanction unless the ideas of the government and the supreme command are one. That point I should like to have understood. That is all.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. T. OKAMOTO (Continued):

Q There was testimony to the effect that

General MINAMI had sent instructions not to establish
a military government, a military administration—that
is, instructions to the Kwantung Army. Did the

Kwantung Army ever breach that order?

A No.

Q Was the assumption of the mayorship of Mukden a violation of that instruction by DOHIMARA?

A As a result of the investigation, the investigations I referred to a little while ago, it was

Mukden only for the purpose of restoring law and order in Mukden because of the chaotic conditions prevailing there at the time.

Q Then the next question is, about the

reported to me that DOHIHARA was appointed mayor of

Q Then the next question is, about the middle of November or about November in 1931 you received a letter from Henry Pu-Yi, didn't you?

A Yes.

Q With regard to this in this Tribunal you said that it was very interesting. What did you mean by "interesting"?

A I was not very much concerned at all with that letter, and I left it alone in a drawer of one of my desks. Some years later when I was cleaning up my drawer I came upon this letter again and then learned for the first time that a man who was formerly an Emperor of China had expressed the view that -- expressed indignation over the maladministration of the Chang regime in the Northeastern Provinces and was seeking for a rectification of such a situation. Upon reading it I felt that it was highly interesting that such a thing was written by such a man. That is all I meant by "interesting." I did not interpret the letter to mean anything with regard to independence or separation from China proper but I did want to know

MINAMI

whether the handwriting in which the letter was written was genuine or not and when I found that it was genuine I thought it was very interesting because by the time I knew the contents of the letter an independent state had already been established and that person himself had become the Emperor of that country.

Q After being sent to Manchukuo as ambassador from Japan did you have many occasions on which to meet the Emperor of Manchukuo?

A Yes, usually and regularly three times a month. That was the schedule.

Q On those occasions did you ever bring up this matter of this letter?

A No.

Q Did you give advice on various matters to the Emperor of Manchukuo directly?

A That is entirely public rumor. At these audiences there were only the Emperor of Manchukuo, myself and an interpreter, whom both the Emperor and I implicitly trusted, and these audiences took place in a private drawing room. At these audiences we merely conversed on various topics of the day and indulged in gossip. The Emperor was a rather lonely man and we did not discuss about politics or about national fortunes but about talks of old times, about

literature and found comfort in these conversations.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, these questions in my submission do not arise out of anything in cross-examination. They merely amplify what was in the original affidavit.

Q In answer to a question of the prosecutor you said that your advice -- advice was given by you to the State of Manchukvo -- was equivalent to orders; is that correct?

THE PRESIDENT: To the interrogator.

A There has been no such case.

THE PRESIDENT: That is a direct denial, if my recollection is clear. Mr. Comyns Carr put to him an interrogation and he confirmed it. You can contradict me if you wish. I may be wrong. That is my recollection.

MR. COMYNS CARR: That is quite correct.

THE WITNESS: May I say a word?

MR. T. OKAMOTO: Please.

THE WITNESS: The question put to me by the prosecutor yesterday was that in connection with the internal guidance of Manchukuo if the Manchukuo government did not comply then you would issue an order, didn't you? At the time the interrogation was

Manchukuo talked with each other on an equal basis, mutually on an equal basis, and the prosecutor understood my words at that time. Then he asked me, won't you be issuing an order if they did not comply with Japan's desire, and I said in reply that if they did not there may be occasions in which an order might be issued -- might have to be issued -- but that in my time no such orders were ever issued. The fact that no orders were issued during my years there is a fact.

Q Did you have any authority to issue such orders even hypothetically?

A No.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I object, your Honor, to that question. The documents showing his authority are in evidence and his own admission that his views amounted to a directive is also in evidence. This is merely an attempt to get him to contradict the answers he has already given.

Q You said as a concrete fact you were against the Concordia Society in Manchuria?

A Yes, I said so.

Q With regard to that, did you ever send any order to Manchuria or make any representations?

A They were different.

Q How did they differ?

A No, only that I did not positively participate in such matters.

Q Did anything happen to the Concordia Society because of your objections, your opposition?

A It continued to exist but because of the attitude taken by the commander in chief with respect to that association it did not develop.

Q Did you ever say that you had authority to direct military and diplomatic affairs of Manchukuo, absolute powers?

A I think I made a very clear reply on that yesterday; that is, in so far as Japan is concerned. That is to say, I said that as the ambassador of Japan in Manchukuo and as the commander in chief of the Kwantung Army I had absolute authority in so far as Japan was concerned. That was the condition that in so far as Japan was concerned Manchukuo itself had its own Foreign Ministry and its own diplomatic service. With those organs I had no connections whatsoever.

Q Was the special service department and the special service organ the same thing or were they different?

A The special service organ, to put it as simply as possible, is an espionage or intelligence organ. The special service department is in the headquarters of the Kwantung Army and an entirely different thing.

Q What were the duties of the special service department?

A It was in charge of matters relating to industry and commerce.

Q Which is the one that you are said to have abolished?

A The special service department in the Kwantung Army. I abolished this department immediately after I assumed my position in Manchukuo with the fear that if it were continued -- if its existence were continued -- it might create various misunder-standings that the Japanese side were interfering in the internal administration of Manchuria.

Q Did this special service department ever deal with opium?

A No.

Q Did the special service organ deal with opium?

A Of course not.

Q In reply to an interrogation by the prosecution did you say that to cross the border of Manchuria would be equivalent to crossing the border of Japan -- to cross the Great Wall of Manchuria would be equivalent to crossing the border of Japan, that is respectively? Did you say that?

Mistake. If crossing the border -- if, for instance, crossing the Yalu River, then that would be crossing from Japanese territory into foreign territory, that is into China. From the standpoint of Manchukuo the Great Wall was a border of Manchukuo, but for China, which did not recognize Manchukuo, it was not a border. So it is needless to say that there is a very great difference between the two. The fact that I strictly prohibited the crossing of the Great Wall for the purpose of maintaining law and order in Manchuria is well known to my Chief of Staff NISHIO and Deputy Chief of Staff ITAGAKI, one of

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

whom is in the dock and the other in Sugamo. A part of the army or some small units of the army may have crossed the border, and I have heard reports that that has happened, but as for the Kwantung Army it has never given any orders or any permission to the army to cross the border. This seems to be a good opportunity for me to add a few words by way of explanation.

In the course of the preliminary interrogations by the prosecution I was asked, "Did not Japan cross the Great Well?" And in the question from the prosecutor yesterday the same question was asked. It was my strong conviction and policy to prohibit the Kwantung Army from crossing the Great Wall. However, if a small part of the Kwantung Army which happened to pursue bandits which had been creating confusion in Manchuria should cross the border -- one or perhaps ten of our troops may have crossed the border, and that may be interpreted as a dispatch of Kwantung Army forces across the border. But I, to all length, deny that the Kwantung Army had ever crossed the Great Wall of China to the other side. I am speaking of this in this sense.

Q In the interrogation of the prosecution

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

did you say that during your tenure as Commander in Chief of the Kwantung Army that Japan occupied all of Manchuria -- or before that?

A The word "occupation" or "occupy" is not a very transpil word. Japan was stationing troops in Manchukuo in accordance with the provisions of the Japan-Manchukuo protocol. The word "occupation" or "occupy" is a highly improper word to use. That is not the case.

Q Do you know whether war and incident are the same thing or different?

A Yes.

Q What are the differences?

THE PRESIDENT: He explained them as far as he could. An incident is something that can be settled locally, according to him.

Q In reply to an interrogation by the prosecution did you say that an incident was the same as an undeclared war?

THE PRESIDENT: He did. Why ask him again? You know he did.

Q Is that your true interpretation?

THE PRESIDENT: Leave it at that. Do not answer. You are not there to get him to contradict himself. Such re-examination is not allowed.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. T. OKAMOTO: There may be some misinterpretation. So I will take that up with the Language Section later. Q While you were Commander in Chief of the Kwantung Army did you have any military plans against China? I do not understand the question. Did you have any military operations plans

against China in the Kwantung Army, that is, while

you were Commander in Chief of the Kwantung Army?

A No.

Q What about with regard to the Soviet Union?

We had the plan prepared -- the national defense plan as prepared by the General Staff Headquarters.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: May the defendant be shown court exhibit 2437? If the court exhibit in question is not there I ask that he be shown exhibit 1973 first.

A little while before you said that that was a letter that you had sent to Foreign Minister UGAKI. Is that your seal on there? Is your signature on there, signature and seal on there? You sent this as the Governor-General of Korea.

This letter does not bear my signature nor

my seal, nor is it written in my handwriting. When I saw this letter -- when this letter was shown to me this morning I recollected this: that UGAKI and I were very, very intimate friends and that this letter was sent to him as an extremely personal and private letter, and I asked my secretary to deliver it to him when he, my secretary, went to Tokyo. I had this letter written by my secretary and asked him to deliver it to General UGAKI when he, my secretary, went to Tokyo.

REDIRECT

Kaprieau & Gerdbers

THE PRESIDENT: There is no denial of authorship of the letter.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, this morning, after long hesitation, the witness admitted in terms that this was his letter. I must object.

THE PRESIDENT: He still says the same thing, but that he didn't sign this.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I am informed that the original shows, by notes upon it, that it was read by both the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister at the time.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: What I am trying to make clear now is why MINAMI, after a long hesitation, finally recognized this letter.

THE MONITOR: What I am trying to ask is why MINAMI hesitated before acknowledging this letter.

THE PRESIDENT: He took so long about it that he must have been sure before he answered. The very hesitation that you emphasized should have secured the correct answer.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: May the witness be shown Court exhibit 1973?

(Whereupon, a paper was handed to the

K u & G oldbe 10

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

30

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: There is no denial of authorship of the letter.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, this morning, after long hesitation, the witness admitted in terms that this was his letter. / I must object.

THE PRESIDENT: He still says the same thing, that he didn't sign this.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I am informed that the original shows, by notes upon it, that it was read by both the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister at the time.

MR. T. OKAMOZO: "hat I am trying to make clear now is why MINAMI, after a long hesitation, finally recognized this letter.

THE MONITOR: What I am trying to ask is why MINAMI hes tated before acknowledging this letter.

THE PRESIDENT: He took so long about it that he must have been sure before he answered. The very hesitation that you emphasized should have secured the correct answer.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: May the witness be shown Court exhibit 1973?

(Whereupon, a paper was handed to the

witness.)

of war to Korea. While you were Governor General in Korea did the Governor General ever take up sucy matters -- this kind of document?

A This is a matter dealt -- handled by the army. I have had no part in it at all.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, this again is an attempt to get the witness to change clear answers which he gave this morning.

THE PRESIDENT: Obviously so, and as a colleague reminds me, this type of examination may be having a disastrous effect on the credibility of the witness.

O In speaking of that document the prosecutor said that the Chief of Staff of the Korean Army was Major General IBARA. Do you have any recollection of that?

A IBARA was not Chief of Staff when I was
Governor General of Korea. The Chief of Staff was
TAVAHASHI. Tan.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, that is a complete contradiction of what he said this morning.

THE WITNESS: Well, I know IBARA, but I

made a mistake in identity in connection with the position. The Chief of Staff of the Korean Army at the time I was Governor General was "AYAHASHI, Tan.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: Despite whether the testimony of the witness is authentic or not -- is credible or not, we must treat fact as fact and take it up accordingly, and it is our duty to have the witness bring out the truth.

BY MR. T. OKAMOTO (Continuing):

Q As Governor-General of Korea did you ever deal with prisoners-of-war affairs?

A As I replied to a question by the prosecutor this morning, I understood from the report from the Director General of Political Affairs of the Governor-General that the Governor-General did what it could when it was asked by the Army if the Governor General could not use its good offices in providing accommodations in the way of buildings for prisoners of war. That is all. --that the Governor General had been consulted by the Army with regard to the provision of accommodations in the way of buildings for prisoners of war.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, the witness now says that some other person was Chief of Staff than the one he admitted this morning. I would ask that the questions which I put to him about IBARA as to whether IBARA was a truthful person should also be put to him with regard to the individual whom he now says was Chief of Staff.

THE PRESIDENT: We will leave it as it is, Mr. Carr.

Q Well, is there anything else besides what you said in which you dealt with prisoners-of-war

affairs?

A When I mentioned -- I spoke of IBARA this morning I made a mistake in identity. I know IBARA, but the Chief of Staff then was TAKAHASHI, Tan. I do not know TAKAHASHI, Tan's qualifications very well, but I have met him and talked with him several times.

THE MONITOR: Not "qualifications" but
"I do not know TAKAHASHI too well, but I have talked
with him. I have seen him."

Q My question was whether the Governor General of Korea had taken part in affairs concerning prisoners of war other than those which you have just related?

A Nothing except consulation or request with regard to housing for prisoners of war.

Q Do you remember when you became President of the Japan Political Society?

A March 30, 1945.

Q As President of the Japan Political Society what kind of an attitude did you take toward the war?

A When I assumed the post of President of the Association there were clear indications of Japanese defeat; and I thought rather than having to engage in a fight to the last man, something should be done

at the proper time to bring the war to an end. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr. MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, in my submission this does not arise out of the cross-examination at all. THE PLESIDENT: I think it does. We will adjourn until half-past nine tomorrow morning. (Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Thursday, 17 April 1947, at 0930.)